APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/593,877	06/14/2000	Al-Riaz Adatia	255/008	8156

26161   7590   08/01/2003

FISH & RICHARDSON PC
225 FRANKLIN ST
BOSTON, MA   02110

EXAMINER
THAI, CUONG T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 08/01/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _May/13/03 Reply to Office Action_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _81-91 and 103-105_ is/are pending in the application.

     4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _81-91 and 103-105_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

     If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

     a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

         1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

         2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

         3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

     * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

     a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

PART III.   DETAIL ACTION

Specification

1.   In view of Reply to Office Action (filed on 05 May 2003), PROSECUTION IS HEREBY

REOPENED.

2.   Claims 81-91 and 103-105 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or

in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for

patent in the United States.

4.   Claim 81 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Bronson (USPN:

5,305,435).

As per claim 81, Bronson discloses a method of presenting information to a user on a

computer-generated display, the method comprising the steps of:

Introducing an image containing information into a display window so as to create an

appearance that the introduced image is sliding into the display window is taught by Bronson as

the technique of under user control for modifying an image of each of the window tabs to be

displayed (see col. 10, lines 30-31) wherein windows appear to slide on the screen (see col.3,

lines 63-64), and secondary window tab 91-93 are off screen, but may be brought back into the viewing area if desired (see col.6, lines 55-57);

Removing an image containing information from the display window so as to create an appearance that the removed image is sliding out of the display window is taught by Bronson as the technique of wherein windows appear to slide on and off the screen (see col.3, lines 63-64) and the window 22 was completely slid off the screen (see col. 6, line 28).

This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

    (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6.   Claims 82-85, 87-88, and 103-105 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentably over Bronson (USPN: 5,305,435) in view of MacKay (USPN: 5,307,456).

As per claim 82, Bronson discloses a method presenting menus to a user having a display window as the technique of the method multi-windows systems often incorporate the features of icons and pull-down menus found in graphic interface (see col. 2, lines 4-6), the method comprising:

Introducing an image containing a menu into the display window so as to create an appearance that the introduced image is sliding into the display window is taught by Bronson as the technique of the method multi-windows systems often incorporate the features of icons and pull-down menus found in graphic interface (see col. 2, lines 4-6), wherein under user control for modifying an image of each of the window tabs to be displayed (see col. 10, lines 30-31) wherein windows appear to slide on the screen (see col.3, lines 63-64), and secondary window tab 91-93 are off screen, but may be brought back into the viewing area if desired (see col.6, lines 55-57);

Removing an image containing a menu from the display window so as to create an appearance that the removed image is sliding out of the display window is taught by Bronson as the technique of multi-windows systems often incorporate the features of icons and pulldown menus found in graphic interface (see col. 2, lines 4-6), wherein windows appear to slide on and off the screen (see col.3, lines 63-64) and the window 22 was completely slid off the screen (see col. 6, line 28).

Bronson, however, does not disclose the limitation of introducing menus to a user of a media player and menu relating to operation of the media player;

MacKay discloses the limitation of introducing menus to a user of a media player and menu relating to operation of the media player as the technique a group of directors are making

edit decisions and direct a group of users in the final editing of a multi-media production (see

col.13, lines 63-65) and commands transmitted video tape recorder could be translated into a

commands PLAY, RECORD, REWIND, JOG, STILL, and STOP (see col. 18, lines 35-39).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include Mackay's introducing menus to a user of a media player and

menu relating to operation of the media player into that of Bronson's window's image slid on

and off the screen, By doing so, the system would be enhanced by bringing menus back into

main focus.

As per claim 83, the limitation of the introduced image contains status information is

taught by Bronson as the technique of causing the window tab to blink on and off while the

function is still being performed would help keep the user informed on the operating status of the

displayed window (see col.4, lines 53-56). This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set

forth above.

As per claim 84, the limitation of the introducing image slides into the display window

from a side of the display window and removed image slides out of the display window to the

side of the display window is taught by Bronson as the technique of secondary tabs 91-93 are off

screen, but may be brought back into the viewing area if desired (see col. 6, lines 55-57) and the

application XYZ, window 24, had been slid off the screen along the right screen edge 16 to

become a virtual window (see col.6, lines 47-49). This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons

as set forth above.

As per claim 85, the limitation of the introducing image slides into the display window from a bottom of the display window and removed image slides out of the display window to the bottom of the display window is taught by Bronson as the technique of the tabs may be arranged along any of the four edges of the screen (see col.4, line 28-29), the secondary tabs 91-93 are off screen, but may be brought back into the viewing area if desired (see col. 6, lines 55-57) and the application XYZ, window 24, had been slid off the screen (see col.6, lines 47-48), and the tabs may be arranged along any of the four edges of the screen (see col.4, line 28-29).This claim is therefore rejected for the reasons as set forth above.

As per claim 87, the limitation of a rate that the images slide into and out of the display window is user-selectable is taught by Bronson as the technique of rather than dragging the window 22 onto the screen a "Fast Restore" option in which the window 22 is automatically returned to its original position on the screen (see col.7, lines 56-59) and the window 22 could be automatically retuned to its off-screen configuration using a "Fast Tab" option. These options would eliminate the need to drag windows on and off the screen (see col.7, lines 63-66). This claim is therefore rejected for the reason as set forth above.

As per claim 88, Bronson discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Bronson discloses a method of a window-based operating system on a computer for displaying in a single window of the window-based operating system a user interface region with a display window integrated into the user interface region as the technique of a computer screen 10 is shown

having multiple windows therein. The windows represent either application programs or data

files (see col.5, lines 41-43), under user control for modifying an image of each of the window

tabs to be displayed (see col. 10, lines 30-31) wherein windows appear to slide on the screen (see

col.3, lines 63-64), and secondary window tab 91-93 are off screen, but may be brought back into

the viewing area if desired (see col.6, lines 55-57), and the window 22 was completely slid off

the screen (see col. 6, line 28).

Bronson, however, does not disclose the limitation of providing visual effects for a media

player corresponding to material being played on the media player.

MacKay discloses the limitation of providing visual effects for a media player

corresponding to material being played on the media player as the technique of various

production media resources such as <u>video, dialog audio, special effects, music audio, and</u>

<u>graphics must be edited and selectively integrated into the overall production</u> (see col.1, lines 25-

28) and multi-media work from where a multi-media work is a work that is comprised of a

number of different media elements such as video, audio, still photos, music, <u>visual effects</u>, etc.

(see col.7, lines 6-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include Mackay's providing visual effects for a media player

corresponding to material being played on the media player into that of Bronson invention. By

doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing multi-media producer work to an end user.

As per new claim 103, Bronson disclose the invention substantially as claimed above. Bronson, however, does not disclose the material being displayed comprises audio material, and the visual effects correspond to the audio material.

Mackay discloses the material comprises audio material and visual effects correspond to the audio material as the technique of various production media resources such as video, dialog audio, special effects, music audio, and graphics must be edited and selectively integrated into the overall production (see col.1, lines 25-28) and multi-media work from where a multi-media work is a work that is comprised of a number of different media elements such as video, audio, still photos, music, **visual effects**, etc. (see col.7, lines 6-9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Mackay's material being displayed comprises audio material, and the visual effects correspond to the audio material into that of Bronson invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing multi-media work to a media player to an end user.

As per new claim 104, Bronson discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Bronson, however, does not disclose the limitation of generating the visual effects at least partly in response to the audio material.

Mackay discloses the limitation of generating the visual effects at least partly in response to the audio material as the technique of a possible set of resources located on the production system network. The production system network 50 includes resources such as special effects systems 75, audio systems 80, film and video systems 84.... which are coupled to the

management information systems 89 (see col. 11, lines 17-22) and see Mixing editing effects

synchronization system 160 into audio systems network (see Fig. 7).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include Mackay's generating and mixing the visual effects at least partly

in response to the audio system network into that of Bronson invention. By doing so, the system

would be enhanced by allowing an end user to generate and mixing special effects as well as

visual effects into audio systems of overall production.

As per new claim 105, Bronson discloses the invention substantially as claimed above.

Bronson, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein the visual effects are generated in

real time.

Mackay discloses the limitation of the visual effects are generated in real time as the

technique of multi-media work from where a multi-media work is a work that is comprised of a

number of different media elements such as video, audio, still photos, music, visual effects, etc.

(see col.7, lines 6-9) wherein multi-media production resources coupled to real-time local area

networks (see col.2, lines 33-34).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include MacKay's multi-media work coupled to real time network into

that of Bronson invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing the most up-

to-date information to an end user.

7.   Claims 86 and 91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentably over

Bronson (USPN: 5,305,435) in view of MacKay (USPN: 5,307,456) and further in view of

Ludolph et al. (USPN: 6,239,798).

As per claim 86, Bronson-MacKay discloses the invention substantially as claimed

above.Bronson-MacKay, however, do not the limitation of introducing image slides into the

display window from a corner of the display window and removed image slides out of the

display window to the corner of the display window;

Ludolph disclose the limitation of introducing image slides into the display window from

a corner of the display window and removed image slides out of the display window to the

corner of the display window as the technique of a Window 95 user can choose to " hide" a task

by selecting a button in the top right corner of the corresponding window. This cause the

computer to remove the corresponding window from the desktop, but the button for the task

remains in the Taskbar. The user can also "show" a previously hidden task by using a mouse to

point at a button in a Taskbar and click the mouse button. This causes the computer to display

the corresponding window on the desktop. The user can also "close" a task by selecting a button

in the top right corner of the task's window (see col. 1 line 66 to col. 2 line 9).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to include Ludolph's introducing image slides into the display window from

a corner of the display window and removed image slides out of the display window to the

corner of the display window into that of Bronson-MacKay combined invention. By soinf so, the

system would enhanced by supplying convenience to an end user.

As per claim 91, Bronson-MacKay discloses the invention substantially as claimed above. Bronson-MacKay, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein the window-based operating system is Linux or Microsoft Windows;

Ludolph disclose the limitation of wherein the window-based operating system is Microsoft Windows as the technique of Microsoft has created a "Taskbar" for the Window 95 operating system that typically resides at the bottom of the user's screen (see col. 1, lines 59-61).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to include Ludolph's the window-based operating system is Microsoft Windows into that of Bronson-MacKay combined invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing an operating system on window based to its system user.

8.   Claim 89 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentably over Bronson (USPN: 5,305,435) in view of MacKay (USPN: 5,307,456) and further in view of Niblack (USPN: 6,181,342).

As per claim 89, Bronson-MacKay disclose the invention substantially as claimed above. Bronson-MacKay, however, do not disclose the limitation of displaying text superimposed over the visual effects.

Niblack discloses the limitation of displaying text superimposed over the visual effects as the technique of selected text being superimposed on the associated visual summary during presentation (see col. 7, lines 60-61).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Niblack's text superimposed over visual effects during

presentation into that of Bronson-MacKay combined invention. By doing so, the system would

be enhanced by providing better detail information to an end user.

9.   Claims 90 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentably over Bronson

(USPN: 5,305,435) in view of MacKay (USPN: 5,307,456) and further in view of Warrin

(USPN: 5,640,522).

As per claim 90, Bronson-MacKay discloses the invention substantially as claimed

above. Bronson-MacKay, however, does not disclose the limitation of wherein the visual effects

displayed on the displayed window are generated based on bit-mapped data.

Warrin discloses the limitation of wherein the visual effects displayed on the displayed

window are generated based on bit-mapped data as the technique of the user preview a different

presentation effect by selecting a visual presentation effect indication displayed in conjunction

with another pair of images (see col. 3, lines 39-42) wherein the previewing program loops

through each column of pixels comprising the bitmap of the source image form the right-most

column to the left-most column (see col. 5, lines 41-43) .

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the

invention was made to include Warrin's visual effects displayed on the displayed window are

generated based on bit-mapped data into that of Bronson-MacKay combined invention. By doing

so, the system would be enhanced by providing visual effect based on bit-mapped data of desired

images to an end user.

10.   The prior art made of record on form PTO-892 and not relied upon is considered

pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant is required under 35 C.F.R. 1.111(c) to consider this

references fully when responding to this action. The document cited herein issued to a method

and system for using dragging technique for sliding objects in and out of focus as well as

authoring and production system which performs in real-time basis.

Conclusion

11.   A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expired THREE

MONTHS, ZERO DAYS from the date of this action. Failure to respond within the period for

response will cause the application to be abandoned.

       Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to CUONG T THAI whose telephone number is (703) 308-7234.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am - 4:00 pm.

       If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John W. Cabeca, can be reached at (703) 308-3116.

       Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-8000.

CUONG T THAI

Examiner

Art Unit 2173 .

***

July 27, 2003